



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,101	03/25/2004	Hideki Kanie	0275M-658COB	6654

27572 7590 03/17/2005

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER

LAVINDER, JACK W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3677

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/809,101

Applicant(s)

KANIE, HIDEKI

Examiner

Jack W. Lavinder

Art Unit

3677

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12-14-04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1, "said holding portion" in line 14 should be –said engageable pawl—in order for the language to be accurate. Claim 7, "a second groove" is defined before "a first groove." The examiner suggests the second be changed to first.

Appropriate correction is required.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 9, line 2, "Fig. 1E should read as "Fig. 2E." on page 11, line 13, "15" should be "17." The specification fails to provide antecedence for the following terms or phrases: claim 7, "second groove aligned with said detaching groove;" claim 8, "said engagable pawl is aligned with said detaching groove;" claim 9, "a first planar engagement surface," "a second generally planar surface," "said retaining portions are moved outward by interaction of said first and second planar engagement surfaces."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1 and 9, the original disclosure fails to disclose a first planar engagement surface interacting with a second planar engagement surface to move the legs and retaining portions to allow the plate members to be fastened. The disclosure provides support for an enlarged portion (15) engaging the legs (25) in order to move the legs and the retaining portions to allow plate members to be fastened.

Also, in claims 1 and 9, how can “a pin accepting aperture have a second planar surface.” An aperture is defined as an opening or hole according to its normal and customary meaning. How can a hole have a planar surface?

Claim 7 introduces new matter. The limitation directed to a groove aligned with a detaching groove has not been disclosed. The detaching groove (22) is not in alignment with either grooves on the shank (17, 18). In fact, the groove on the shank, in the assembled state, is 90 degrees from an axis connecting the detaching grooves. The groove on the shank is not in any alignment with the detaching grooves.

Claim 8, the original disclosure does not disclose an engagement pawl (19) aligned with the detaching grooves (22). The engagement pawl is located 90 degrees along the circumference of the ring (21) away from the detaching grooves.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3677

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-4 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asami, 5568675 in view of Wollar, 4405272.

The rejections of claims 1-4 and 6 based on Asami in view of Wollar are applied as set in previous office action mailed 7/16/2004. New claims 7-9, as understood, are also rejected under the same grounds and explanation as claims 1-4 and 6.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Asami in view of Wollar and further in view of Hasselbacher, 4158512.

The rejection of claim 5 based on Asami in view of Wollar and Hasselbacher is applied as set forth in previous office action mailed 7/16/2004.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 12/14/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the independent claims fail to include planar surfaces on the pin and bush members that are slidably engagable with each other to separate the pair of legs. In view of the 112 first and second paragraph rejections and the objections to the specification and claims above, as understood, Asami discloses a surface on the pin and on the bush that engage one another to separate the legs (11).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3677

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack W. Lavinder whose telephone number is 703-308-3421. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday, 9-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Swann can be reached on 703-306-4115. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3677

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Jack W Lavinder
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3677

3/11/05